

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA et. al.,  
Defendants.

Case Nos. [24-cv-2153-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2180-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2181-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2182-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2239-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2241-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2242-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2243-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2254-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2261-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2308-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2437-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2438-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-2439-PJH](#)

**ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE  
CASES WITH PREJUDICE**

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed multiple pro se civil rights complaints under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also has a pending federal habeas petition in this court with appointed counsel. See *Bonilla v. Ayers*, Case No. 08-0471 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas proceedings. See *In re Bonilla*, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7.

Plaintiff presents nearly identical claims in these actions. He names as defendants various state courts and agencies. He seeks relief regarding his underlying conviction or how his other cases were handled by the state and federal courts.

To the extent that plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in these cases, he has been disqualified from proceeding IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is “under imminent danger of serious physical injury” at the time he filed his complaint. 28

1 U.S.C. 1915(g); *In re Steven Bonilla*, Case No. 11-3180 CW; *Bonilla v. Dawson*, Case  
2 No. 13-0951 CW.

3 The allegations in these complaints do not show that plaintiff was in imminent  
4 danger at the time of filing. Therefore, he may not proceed IFP. Moreover, even if an  
5 IFP application were granted, his lawsuits would be barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512  
6 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971), *Demos v. U.S.*  
7 *District Court*, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) or *Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy Court*,  
8 828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the cases are dismissed with  
9 prejudice. The court notes that plaintiff has an extensive history of filing similar frivolous  
10 cases.<sup>1</sup>

11 The clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close these cases. The clerk  
12 shall return, without filing, any further documents plaintiff submits in these closed cases.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: April 29, 2024

15   
16 

---

  
17 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
18 United States District Judge  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 The undersigned is the fourth judge assigned cases filed by plaintiff. This is the 62nd  
2 order issued by the undersigned since April 30, 2020, pertaining to 840 different cases.  
3 Plaintiff filed 962 other cases with the three other judges since 2011.